

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9-13, 18-20, and 23-50 are pending. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 14, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Buschmann. Claims 1-3, 9-12, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weinstein. Claims 1-3, 9-12, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trusty et al. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura. Claims 11-14 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson. Claims 11-14, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kursel et al. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Filicicchia et al. Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filicicchia et al. Claims 2, 11-13, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filicicchia et al. in view of Trusty et al. Claims 6, 7, 8, 15 and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner is thanked for their careful examination of the present application and for their indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant is therefore amending claims in the present application in order to conform with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former claim 6. Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former claim 15. New claim 26 incorporates the subject matter of former claim 16. New claim 32 incorporates the subject matter of former claim 8. New claim 38 incorporates the subject matter of former claim 16. It is understood, however, that the applicants do not agree with the Examiner's rejections based on the cited references, and are amending claims solely for the purpose of expediting the issuance of the allowable subject matter. Applicants therefore reserve the right to include any of the present claims, in non-amended form, in any continuation, divisional or continuation-in-part application.

Claim 20 has been amended and the patentably distinct differences between the cited references and the language of claim 20 will be specifically pointed out. As amended claim 20 recites “[a] method of sensing a level of a liquid retained within a storage vessel of a spray applicator, comprising: sensing a first volume of the liquid retained within the vessel solely based upon a first resistance value of the liquid; removing a portion of the first volume to define a second volume within the storage vessel; sensing the second volume solely based upon a second resistance value of the liquid; comparing the first resistance value to the second resistance

value; and generating an alarm signal if the second resistance value is indicative of the second volume being less than a predetermined minimum volume.” The cited references, and particularly Filicicchia and Trusty, do not disclose or fairly suggest sensing the first and second volumes of liquid within the storage vessel solely based upon the resistance of the volume of liquid within the storage vessel in combination with generating an alarm signal if the second volume is less than the predetermined minimum value. To the contrary, Filicicchia is silent as to the particular sensor employed and Trusty discloses using a capacitance sensor or a magnetic float sensor. Neither a capacitance sensor nor a magnetic float sensor senses the liquid solely based upon the resistance of the volume of liquid in the storage vessel. A capacitance sensor relies on more complicated alternating current or voltage based circuitry than a system that senses the volume of a liquid in a supply vessel solely based upon resistance of the liquid. Therefore, claim 20 is patentable over the cited references. Claims depending from claim 20 are also allowable due to depending from an allowable base claim and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

New claim 43 recites “[a] spray applicator, comprising: a gun configured to receive a liquid and atomize the liquid; and a supply vessel coupled to the gun that supplies the liquid to the gun, the supply vessel retaining a volume of the liquid and including a level sensor responsive to the volume retained by the supply vessel, the level sensor including a sensor element configured to detect a liquid volume solely by sensing a resistance property of the liquid.” The cited references do not disclose or fairly suggest the sensor element of the level sensor being configured to detect a liquid volume within the supply vessel solely by sensing a resistance property of the liquid in the supply vessel in combination with the other limitations. Therefore, claim 43 is patentable over the cited references. Claims depending from claim 43 are also allowable due to depending from an allowable base claim and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable.
Favorable consideration and a timely Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP



Marcus Simon
Registration No. 50,258
Telephone No. (206) 903-8787

MS:clr

Enclosures:

- Postcard
- Check
- Fee Transmittal Sheet (+ copy)

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3400
Seattle, WA 98101-4010
(206) 903-8800 (telephone)
(206) 903-8820 (fax)

h:\ip\clients\trade associates\501326.01\501326.01 092005 oa amendment.doc